

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 94 21:30:44 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #620
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 3 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 620

Today's Topics:

Bizarre QST Statemen
Daily Summary of Solar Geophysical Activity for 02 June
Field Day Rules Question
Invalid destination cc:Mail name
N. Colorado Hamfest
N7RO QSL bureau
RFD:Radio repair rip-off?? (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 4 Jun 94 00:06:04 GMT
From: newstf01.cr1.aol.com!search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Bizarre QST Statemen
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun3.101857.1151@pacs.sunbelt.net>,
ddepew@CHM.TEC.SC.US writes:

>If anyone knows about the mod to convert FT101 to 6146's I'd
>appreciate
>details. Please respond by e-mail. Thanks.

>Dorr Depew
>N4QIX

There is a mod in the the June 1981 issue of the Fox-Tango Club Newsletter that describes how to change the 6JS6 tubes to the GE 8950. This is also a sweep tube and I have no idea if these are still available anywhere.

Hope this helps.

73, Terry KJ7F

Date: 3 Jun 94 20:19:06 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!
nntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!ve6mgs!usenet@uchvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: Daily Summary of Solar Geophysical Activity for 02 June
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

/\

DAILY SUMMARY OF SOLAR GEOPHYSICAL ACTIVITY

02 JUNE, 1994

/\

(Based In-Part On SESC Observational Data)

SOLAR AND GEOPHYSICAL ACTIVITY INDICES FOR 02 JUNE, 1994

NOTE: Electron fluence at greater than 2 MeV continued at moderate to high levels today. The background x-ray flux continues below A1.0 levels.

!!BEGIN!! (1.0) S.T.D. Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for DAY 153, 06/02/94
10.7 FLUX=067.9 90-AVG=082 SSN=000 BKI=4444 2433 BAI=021
BGND-XRAY=A1.0 FLU1=4.8E+05 FLU10=1.2E+04 PKI=4444 3333 PAI=019
BOU-DEV=056,040,041,060,012,041,023,025 DEV-AVG=037 NT SWF=00:000
XRAY-MAX= A4.0 @ 1545UT XRAY-MIN= A1.0 @ 2348UT XRAY-AVG= A1.8
NEUTN-MAX= +001% @ 2220UT NEUTN-MIN= -002% @ 1530UT NEUTN-AVG= -0.3%
PCA-MAX= +0.1DB @ 2320UT PCA-MIN= -0.3DB @ 0105UT PCA-AVG= -0.0DB
BOUTF-MAX=55342NT @ 0140UT BOUTF-MIN=55293NT @ 1649UT BOUTF-AVG=55313NT
GOES7-MAX=P:+000NT@ 0000UT GOES7-MIN=N:+000NT@ 0000UT G7-AVG=+078,+000,+000
GOES6-MAX=P:+131NT@ 1821UT GOES6-MIN=N:-072NT@ 2358UT G6-AVG=+119,+031,-027
FLUXFCST=STD:070,070,070;SESC:070,070,070 BAI/PAI-FCST=020,020,020/035,030,025
KFCST=4455 5444 4445 4444 27DAY-AP=033,040 27DAY-KP=4564 3335 6665 4343
WARNINGS=*GSTRM;*AURMIDWRN
ALERTS=

!!END-DATA!!

NOTE: The Effective Sunspot Number for 01 JUN 94 was 12.9.

The Full Kp Indices for 01 JUN 94 are: 4o 4o 5- 5- 3+ 3- 3+ 3o

The 3-Hr Ap Indices for 01 JUN 94 are: 26 29 38 37 20 13 19 15

Greater than 2 MeV Electron Fluence for 02 JUN is: 8.1E+08

SYNOPSIS OF ACTIVITY

Solar activity was very low. The disk remains spotless.

Solar activity forecast: solar activity is expected to be very low.

The geomagnetic field has been at mostly unsettled to active levels for the past 24 hours. High latitude stations reported minor storm levels between 02/0900UT - 1500UT. Activity is most likely due to a favorably positioned coronal hole. Energetic electron flux (GT 2 MeV) ranged from normal to high levels over the past 24 hours.

Geophysical activity forecast: the geomagnetic field is expected to be mostly unsettled to active for the entire forecast period. High latitude stations should expect periods of minor to major storm conditions during local nighttime. Active conditions are expected to persist through the 6th.

Event probabilities 03 jun-05 jun

Class M	01/01/01
Class X	01/01/01
Proton	01/01/01
PCAF	Green

Geomagnetic activity probabilities 03 jun-05 jun

A. Middle Latitudes

Active	25/25/25
Minor Storm	20/20/20
Major-Severe Storm	15/15/10

B. High Latitudes

Active	25/25/25
Minor Storm	25/25/25
Major-Severe Storm	20/20/20

HF propagation conditions continued below normal over most regions, particularly on transpolar and transauroral paths. Similar conditions are expected over the next 3 days, through 05 June inclusive, although gradual stabilization is expected to take place during this period as well. Night-sectors will continue to be the most disturbed.

COPIES OF JOINT USAF/NOAA SESC SOLAR GEOPHYSICAL REPORTS

REGIONS WITH SUNSPOTS. LOCATIONS VALID AT 02/2400Z JUNE

NMBR LOCATION LO AREA Z LL NN MAG TYPE
7728 S07W53 322 PLAGE
REGIONS DUE TO RETURN 03 JUNE TO 05 JUNE
NMBR LAT LO
NONE

LISTING OF SOLAR ENERGETIC EVENTS FOR 02 JUNE, 1994

BEGIN MAX END RGN LOC XRAY OP 245MHZ 10CM SWEEP
NONE

POSSIBLE CORONAL MASS EJECTION EVENTS FOR 02 JUNE, 1994

BEGIN MAX END LOCATION TYPE SIZE DUR II IV
NO EVENTS OBSERVED

INFERRED CORONAL HOLES. LOCATIONS VALID AT 02/2400Z

ISOLATED HOLES AND POLAR EXTENSIONS
EAST SOUTH WEST NORTH CAR TYPE POL AREA OBSN
83 S60E46 S60E46 S36W74 S30W19 275 EXT NEG 066 10830A
84 N42W12 N35W20 N40W24 N45W14 284 ISO POS 001 10830A
85 S04E86 S06E66 S02E40 N06E61 200 ISO POS 010 10830A

SUMMARY OF FLARE EVENTS FOR THE PREVIOUS UTC DAY

Date Begin Max End Xray Op Region Locn 2695 MHz 8800 MHz 15.4 GHz

NO EVENTS OBSERVED.

REGION FLARE STATISTICS FOR THE PREVIOUS UTC DAY

	C	M	X	S	1	2	3	4	Total	(%)
Uncorrelated:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	000	(0.0)

Total Events: 000 optical and x-ray.

EVENTS WITH SWEEPS AND/OR OPTICAL PHENOMENA FOR THE LAST UTC DAY

Date	Begin	Max	End	Xray	Op	Region	Locn	Sweeps/Optical Observations
NO EVENTS OBSERVED.								

NOTES:

All times are in Universal Time (UT). Characters preceding begin, max, and end times are defined as: B = Before, U = Uncertain, A = After. All times associated with x-ray flares (ex. flares which produce associated x-ray bursts) refer to the begin, max, and end times of the x-rays. Flares which are not associated with x-ray signatures use the optical observations to determine the begin, max, and end times.

Acronyms used to identify sweeps and optical phenomena include:

II	= Type II Sweep Frequency Event
III	= Type III Sweep
IV	= Type IV Sweep
V	= Type V Sweep
Continuum	= Continuum Radio Event
Loop	= Loop Prominence System,
Spray	= Limb Spray,
Surge	= Bright Limb Surge,
EPL	= Eruptive Prominence on the Limb.

** End of Daily Report **

Date: 3 Jun 1994 20:12:43 GMT
 From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
 news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!ham@network.ucsd.edu
 Subject: Field Day Rules Question
 To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

With FD, I can't see TOO many potential problems, though.

Date: 4 Jun 94 01:55:00 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Invalid destination cc:Mail name
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Date: 03-Jun-1994 17:00:51
To: Ronald B Melton
*To: Info-Hams@UCSD.EDU at -SMTPlink
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #619

Directions to the NCARC Superfest.

This years Superfest is located at the Larimer County Fairgrounds in Loveland, Colorado. From I25 from either the north or south take the Colorado 402 west exit. Continue west on Colo.402 past US287. About a half mile west of US287 you will cross a set of railroad tracks. Immediately after crossing the tracks turn north on Roosevelt Ave. Continue north on Roosevelt until it crosses the same railroad tracks again. At this point Roosevelt turns into Railroad Ave. At this point you should see the fairgrounds on the east side of the road. The hamfest will be held in the McMillian Building. Admission is \$3. Talk in is on 145.115 with a - offset and 100Hz PL. If you do not have PL encode you can turn off the PL on the repeater by transmitting a 0*. A 1* turns the PL back on again.

Roger Mitchell
N0MCR

Date: Fri, 03 Jun 94 02:18:30 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
paladin.american.edu!zombie.ncsc.mil!news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ub!dsinc!
wells!w2up!barry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: N7RO QSL bureau
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

slay@netcom.com (Sandy Lynch) writes:

> Barry Kutner (barry@w2up.wells.com) wrote:
>
> : Derek - I think you are missing my point (sort of). The two I mentioned
> : are profiteers. DJ6SI (and some others) are professional DXpeditioners.
> : They make a nice living by going to places (yes, some rare) and raking in
> : the bucks for QSLs. It's one thing to contribute voluntarily for an
> : expedition (which I frequently do). It's another to "extort" money by
> : REQUIRING a donation for a QSL. This practice should be banned on
> : ethical grounds by ARRL.
>
> : Let see how fast these guys change their
> : practices if their expeditions don't count for DXCC.
>
> An example of changing their practices: they STOP going on DXpeditions?
>
> Would that be a bad thing? IMHO, yes. Just how much money "raking in the
> bucks" do you figure a guy like DJ6SI makes (NET) anyway?
> Should we prohibit DXpeditioners from collecting any funds whatsoever?
> Why be so concerned that somebody is making some money? Is there a
> problem in helping, whether by request or demand, to make a contri-
> bution to the costs of his going to some out-of-the-way locale?
> How much "fun" is there in going to VP8SSI where the DXpeditioners

> came close to becoming premature silent keys? We're not always talking
> about stopping of in some wonderful tropical island with a three or four
> star hotel, ya know.
> -----
> How's about we let these guys go off to Peter 1 or wherever Baldur
> wants to go then, instead of sending in money for a QSL .. we
> simply give up the whole practice of QSLing for DXCC? That's right,
> let's use the "honor system". If you say you worked 'em on 160m -
> that good enough! It gets rid of the (relatively) high cost of QSLing
> AND saves a lot of time in updating your DXCC totals.
>
> Cheers de, Sandy
> WA6BXH/7J1ABV
> slay@netcom.com
>

Makes sense to me Sandy. I chase DX for me, and nobody else. And I have
enough shoeboxes full of cards!

=====
Barry N. Kutner, W2UP Usenet/Internet: barry@w2up.wells.com
Newtown, PA Packet Radio: W2UP @ WB3JOE.#EPA.PA.USA.NA
 Packet Cluster: W2UP >K2TW (FRC)

.....

Date: Fri, 3 Jun 1994 19:21:05 GMT
From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!
gatech!newsfeed.pitt.edu!nntp.club.cc.cmu.edu!cantaloupe.srv.cs.cmu.edu!dolphin!
ed@ames.arpa
Subject: RFD:Radio repair rip-off??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi Ed here, I have worked as a "Tech" for consumer, industrial, video, and
computer electronics since I was 16. I have worked for a number of shops and
corporations. I think I have seen most of the common rip-offs and the ways
that they were done.

>"So I left it off a a local repair shop and told the owner I though it might
>well need new finals and alignment."

Is this a "ham radio" repair shop or 'Garys TV,VCR,Microwave,Stereo,& blender
shop'?

>He charged me a \$45 "bench fee" which would not be refundable but would be
>credited toward the repairs...

This is common among shops to have some sort of bench fee to cover the time and equipment that is needed to do a functional test and diagnostic, or at least as much as can be done to a piece of equipment depending on how bad it is. But \$45.00 sounds excessive for a ham radio from my experience.

>They send the work out to a technician.

He (tech) probably charges \$20 for a bench fee and this other shop doubled it and made an extra 5er for transporting it to the other tech. It starts sounding shady right there.

>estimate of \$225 to \$250

The TECH Probably said \$100 - \$125 and the SHOP doubled it. \$75.00 for parts and \$35 for labor = \$110 My personal feeling is this is fair for the labor and equipment needed to do this.

>it was apparent that they never actually opened up the set, and that the
>quote was based on my impression that it might need new finals and alignment.

An experienced tech could have given an estimate without NECESSARILY opening up the case. I am a new ham, waiting for my call, but this is how I would check a rig... MY OWN PERSONAL OPINION - NOT NECESSARILY THE ONLY OR BEST WAY...

1. power, lights, fan, tube filaments.
2. Antenna, receiver, audio, vfo, band switching.
3. dummy & wattmeter, cw check for rf output / plate tuning meter
4. if rf output low or none, OPEN CASE & check for hi voltage at tube sockets.
5. TEST or attempt to test tube emission.
6. If tubes were expensive \$75 is expensive from my point of view, I would also check for rf drive to final tubes with scope.

ITS MY PERSONAL REPUTATION IN MY WORK. ITS MY EMPLOYERS REPUTATION IN THEIR PRICES AND THEIR/MY WORK.

Bottom Line Jim, I think you learned an expensive lesson about that company.

Electronic repair is an easy place to rip people off. Its Proven, I've seen the hidden camera stuff on tv of guys charging \$125.00 for rebuilding powersupplies when all it needed was a 2a fuse.

I don't know if you will get your money back, but definately post this companys name and phone number to all the hams you know.

Ed Bathgate
Senior Test Tech
Fore Systems Inc.

The above comments are my own, and not necessarily the opinion of
my present employer.

Date: Fri, 03 Jun 1994 14:29:39 -0400
From: dale.ksc.nasa.gov!algot.ksc.nasa.gov!k4dii.ksc.nasa.gov!user@ames.arpa
Subject: RFD:Radio repair rip-off??
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jun3.170147.18537@news.yale.edu>, revco@YALE.EDU (Jim
Revkin) wrote:

> I'd like to get the groups opinion. Keep in mind while I know some
> radio theory, I'm no repair person. Question: I decided to try
> to get my original transceiver a Kenwood TS 520 back on the air.
> In trying to tune up, there was basically no power output. So I
> left it off a a local repair shop and told the owner I though it might
> well need new finals and alignment.

Jim-

It sounds to me like you were hasty taking the rig to that particular shop.
Are they a TV shop or something?

Regardless of how they do business, it isn't unreasonable for a shop to
charge \$30 to \$50 per hour. It could take 5 to 8 hours of labor getting
the set back in shape, barring unforeseen problems. Such problems are
likely in an old rig that worked when you put it away, but doesn't now.

Someone who likes to work on their own gear might do well with a TS-520.
However, it has practically zero value to you, considering market value vs
cost of repair. I suggest you mark the \$45 up to experience, and cut your
losses. If you chose to fight the bench fee (beyond initial pleading!),
you would probably lose in court, and the emotional turmoil isn't worth it.

73, Fred, K4DII

Date: 3 Jun 1994 15:28:50 -0500
From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!
howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!
not-for-mail@ames.arpa

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <rogjdCqq72H.6u4@netcom.com>, <2slc6j\$kkkn@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<gregCqtnE8.H5o@netcom.com>swrinde
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <gregCqtnE8.H5o@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote:

>Perhaps. However a significant number of amateurs believe that the 'closed'
>repeater is contrary to the principle that no individual or group 'owns'
>a frequency.

You are correct, no one owns the frequency. The trustee does, however, own the radio equipment (the "station"). There's nothing in part 97 which prevents anyone from putting a repeater on any frequency. Only that they cannot cause interference. It's only courtesy that has kept frequency coordination going for these many years.

>However, in areas where spectrum is becoming critical, we believe that the
>band plan should dictate that OPEN repeaters have priority

I contend that if the repeater is being used, it makes no difference whether it's open or closed. If the frequency isn't being used, perhaps you might have a case for putting another system on the frequency...but an active repeater that happens to be closed has just as much right to be on the air as any open one.

A frequency coordinator cannot be asked to make this judgement call. He will be sued if he does. Most _volunteers_ are unwilling to accept this liability. Are you willing to accept it?

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT		"Real Texans don't let the truth get in
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com		the way of a good story."

Date: 3 Jun 1994 19:18:09 -0700
From: btree.brooktree.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jun1.002342.4409@pb2esac.com>,
<1994Jun2.160404.28172@llyene.jpl.nasa.gov>, <2sndod\$qpt@tymix.tymnet.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2sndod\$qpt@tymix.tymnet.com>,
Dick Flanagan <flanagan@niagara.Tymnet.COM> wrote:

>In article <1994Jun2.160404.28172@llyene.jpl.nasa.gov>
laborde@kilroy.jpl.nasa.gov (Greg LaBorde (525)) writes:
>>In article <1994Jun1.002342.4409@pb2esac.com>,
>>>We were told in rather curt terms that no-code techs were not welcome there.
>
>>I daresay you will _NOT_ be welcomed there after an insulting post like this.

>Sounds like a real friendly place!

Welcome to the world of Southern Californian closed repeaters!

--

Roger Bly
roger@brooktree.com

Date: 3 Jun 1994 19:15:44 -0700
From: btree.brooktree.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2slc6j\$kkkn@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>, <gregCqtnE8.H5o@netcom.com>,
<2snjlc\$72p@nyx10.cs.du.edu>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <2snjlc\$72p@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
Jay Maynard <jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu> wrote:

>Right. How are you going to compensate the owners of closed repeaters - and
>remember that, according to the FCC, _ALL_ repeaters are closed - for the loss
>of their investment of time and money in building up their system?

They are not being deprived of their "investment", they are being told that
they must open the machine to all amateurs and not selectively deny access.
Of course the control operator can control and repeater and shut it down at
any time and use a published PL to reduce interference. You can fund your
machine by collecting "club dues", etc, but you can't require it. That's what
I am looking for... That's my definition of "open".

>Any coordinating body that tries to take away folks' coordinations without a
>good cause - and suddenly deciding that closed repeaters are less worthy than
>open ones is not likely to be seen by a court as 'good cause' - is going to
>get its collective butts sued off.

That's why we are working to get the FCC to give priority to "open" systems
because they more closely fit the spirit and intent of the amateur service. If

you are following the law, you are pretty well protected.

I have spoken with three lawyers who disagree with you (one who agrees) on the issue that requiring you to "open up" results in a damage. You do not lose your investment; worst case is you sell your equipment.

I took the extreme view on this issue because it has worked the best (on the air) at getting people past the "there are still plenty of open repeaters, so who cares" cop out. The radio spectrum is a scarce resource, we can either let it go the highest bidder, or share it. A band full of closed repeaters isn't very conducive to sharing.

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.UUCP) summed it up most succinctly:

"The spectrum is a limited public resource. Closed repeaters don't serve the amateur community at large as well as open systems, so as a policy matter, open repeaters should be the preferred occupants of the spectrum.

I recognize that closed systems are legal, but I don't consider them desirable. As spectrum management policy, spectrum should be allocated to serve the needs of the largest number of users. Since open systems don't place limits on who can use them, they make their chunk of spectrum more accessible to more amateurs than closed systems do."

Gotta jam,
Roger Bly
--

Roger Bly
roger@brooktree.com

Date: 3 Jun 1994 15:36:26 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <gregCqtnE8.H5o@netcom.com>, <2snjlc\$72p@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<gregCqu5LJ.62G@netcom.com>uga
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <gregCqu5LJ.62G@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote:

>So if I decide to put an open repeater on the frequency of your closed

>coordinated repeater in the same coverage area you believe that you must share
>the frequency with me, if nobody is on your machine and I, for example, publish
>my PL tones? And that, as control operator, you will humbly shut down your
>machine if someone from your group accesses it while mine has people talking
>on it?

There's nothing in Part 97 which prevents you from doing just that. The rules only say that if you cause interference to the coordinated system, you have primary responsibility to solve the problem. Only courtesy has kept the coordination system alive until now.

>All the semantics and vested-interest arguments are understood. Those of
>us who believe that open machines come first when the crunch comes simply
>reject them. We understand that it causes burden and expense to closed
>machine users. And we still believe that it's the right thing to do.

Ahh! We FINALLY get to the REAL root of this discussion...you're right and we're wrong...

Who died and made you God?

--
Jim Reese, WD5IYT | "Real Texans don't let the truth get in
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com | the way of a good story."

Date: 3 Jun 1994 15:19:58 -0500
From: lll-winken.llnl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!swrinde!
news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!not-for-mail@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2sma1n\$mku@kaiwan.kaiwan.com>, <2sn1dc\$5hf@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>,
<gregCqts8v.45J@netcom.com>eo.neoso
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

In article <gregCqts8v.45J@netcom.com>, Greg Bullough <greg@netcom.com> wrote:

>Rather interesting that the
>phrase 'closed repeater' and 'accomodate everyone' can be used together,
>I think. But typical of the convoluted logic which those who are reaching
>to justify their monopolization of a frequency on a a crowded band.

Let's not twist my meaning here...

By "accomodate everyone", I meant that the coordinating body must accomodate

equally both trustees of open repeaters and trustees of closed ones. Its job is to minimize interference, not make judgement calls as to who is "more worthy" of a frequency.

--

Jim Reese, WD5IYT		"Real Texans don't let the truth get in
jreese@sugar.neosoft.com		the way of a good story."

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #620
